[2nd November 1935

(*d*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) Yes. A brief summary of it is given below:—

The relations between the Vysyas and the Muslims at Kandukur are very strained. In April this year Sri Rama Navami and Muharrum coincided. The trouble which arose then over Hindu music in the neighbourhood of mosques was averted by suitable measures. On the 18th September 1935, music close to a mosque caused the trouble to break out afresh. There was a clash between the two communities in which one Vysya was slightly injured. As a result of the clash, the Vysyas arranged to boycott Muslim jutkas and trades. Jutkas ply between Kandukur and Singarayakonda Railway station and are owned entirely by Muslims. The Muslims were badly hit by the boycott. The Hindus also turned out the Muslim tailors who were accustomed to ply their trade on the verandahs of Hindu houses. The Hindus fearing retaliation engaged watchmen to protect their houses. On the night of the 17th October 1935, the Hindus and the Muslims quarrelled and injured each other. Three Hindus and two Muslims are reported to have sustained minor injuries. This incident caused numbers of Hindus and Muslims to collect with sticks and prepare for a fight, but the opposing crowds were dispersed before they actually met.

(*b*) The Government have not received any representation from the Hindus. There is no information whether any was received by the Collector.

(*c*) & (*d*) The District Magistrate has already taken steps to prevent a recurrence of similar incidents. No action by the Government is called for.

Registration.

Levy of additional registration fee on lengthy documents.

* 424-D *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the maximum number of words that are to be contained in each document for registration is prescribed for registering without any extra charge;

(*b*) if so, whether a copy of the rule or order in the matter will be placed on the table; and

(*c*) on what principles such a rule or order was passed?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Member of the Legislative Council presumably refers to the Notification No. 95, Law (Registration),

2nd November 1935]

dated 9th December 1931, prescribing additional registration fees in the case of lengthy documents occupying more than two pages in the register. A copy [a] of the notification is annexed.

(c) The levy of the fee was made to meet the extra work involved in copying lengthy documents.

UNSTARRED QUESTION

Police

Alleged entry of the Police into the house of one Santhana Kudumban of Vadugapatti village, Madura district.

425 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur R. SRINIVASAN: Will the Hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether, in connexion with a complaint of theft on the 18th March 1935 in Vadugapatti village, Madura district, against one Thangarazu, son of Santhana Kudumban, the Police entered the house of Santhana Kudumban, removed paddy stored there and beat Santhana Kudumban and his children;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that Santhana Kudumban and his children were ill when the Police entered his house and beat them; and

(*c*) if the answer is in the affirmative, what steps the Government took with regard to this action of the Police?

A.—(*a*) It is a fact that the police entered the house of Santhana Kudumban in connexion with a complaint of theft on the 18th March 1935 in Vadugapatti village and seized some paddy suspected to have been stolen, but neither he nor his children were beaten by the police. The paddy seized having been found on examination, to be of a different kind to that stolen was immediately returned to the owner.

(*b*) Santhana Kudumban was seriously ill at the time of the search but his children were not ill.

(*c*) The conduct of the police not being improper, the question of taking action against them does not arise.

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

III.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908 (BILL No. 2 OF 1935).

Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Sir, I thank the Government first of all for having given the House an opportunity to discuss this * motion on a non-official Bill, on an official day. Of course it will be

* The motion to refer the above Bill to a Select Committee was discussed in part on 8th August 1935 and the further consideration thereof was adjourned to this meeting.

a Printed as Appendix VII on page 509 infra.